

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 13-21 and 25 were examined in the Non Office Action mailed on 09/11/2009 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). All the claims were rejected.

5 By virtue of this paper, claims 1, 7, 10 and 16 are sought to be amended and a supplemental declaration by inventor under 37 CFR § 1.132 is sought be submitted. The amendments are believed not to introduce new matter and their entry is respectfully requested. The amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer.

Examiner Interview

10 As noted above, a telephone interview was conducted with Examiner Sanders on 01 December 2009. Only the undersigned representative and the Examiner Basher were the participants.

15 As noted in the Interview Summary form PTOL 413 mailed by the Examiner, affidavit under 37 CFR § 1.132 was discussed. The Examiner suggested submission of objective evidence of long felt need. The Examiner is thanked for the telephone interview as well as the suggestion.

20 The applicant is believed to have met the burden of making of record the Substance of the Interview. See MPEP 713.04 for further clarification.

Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)

25 The Examiner's attention is directed to the submission of a Supplemental IDS on/around the same day as submission of this paper. The references sought to be relied upon in the Supplemental Declaration under 37 CFR § 1.132 (sought to be filed with this paper), are presented for consideration by the Examiner. Consideration of these documents and making them of record is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

30 Claims 1, 7, 10, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, noting that the term "the combination" in "wherein the combination indicates" lacks antecedent basis in the claims. As suggested by the Examiner, the term is sought to be changed to "each combination".

Withdrawal of the rejection is under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

Supplemental Declaration Under 37 CFR § 1.132

For the reasons noted above in the Examiner Interview section, a Supplemental Declaration under 37 CFR § 1.132 by inventor Mr. Krishnamohan Itikarlapalli, is submitted herewith. The declaration (along with the Applicant's admitted prior art and other references of record) clearly establishes that the invention of the presented independent claims satisfies a long-felt need which was recognized, persistent and not solved by others, as required under MPEP 716.04(1).

Thus, even assuming *arguendo* that the references in isolation teach each of the features of the independent claims and/or the Examiner has established a *prima facie* case of obviousness, it is respectfully submitted that such a *prima facie* has been adequately rebutted.

It is further noted that a copy of each of the non-patent references noted in the Supplemental Declaration is submitted in the Supplemental IDS submitted on even date herewith. Accordingly, additional copies of these references are not provided.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 16-17, 20-21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, Fig. 1 and specification paragraphs 22-33 ("AAPA"), in view of Gostanian *et al*, U.S. 5,781,910 (hereafter "Gostanian"), and in view of Lordi *et al*, U.S. 5,857,204 (hereafter "Lordi").

Without acquiescing to any of the Examiner's assertions, at least for the reasons noted above with respect to the Supplemental Declaration, it is submitted that the combined teachings of the art of record does not render obvious the invention of independent claims 1, 7, 10 and 16. One skilled in the relevant arts, without the benefit of the disclosure, would not have been motivated to combined the references as claimed in each of the currently amended independent claims.

All the independent claims are accordingly allowable over the art of record. The dependent claims are allowable at least as depending from the allowable base claims. Thus, all

the presented claims are allowable over the art of record.

Conclusion

5 Thus, it is believed that all objections and rejections have been overcome and continuation of examination is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at 443-552-7281 (4AM-noon EST) if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Date: December 11, 2009

Respectfully submitted,
/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/
Signature
Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number: 41,416